

Remarks/Arguments

Reconsideration of this application, as now presented, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12 are pending in this application.

Claims 4-6, 8, 9 and 11 stand objected to as being dependent on rejected claims, but are considered to contain allowable subject matter.

Claims 1 and 3 stand objected to because of there being errors in each claim. These have been corrected by inserting --in-- between "extending" and "a", in line 5 of claim 1, and by inserting --four-- between "least" and "intake", in line 4 of claim 3.

Claims 1-3, 7, 10, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wuebbels et al. '378 in view of Mathews. It is respectfully submitted that this rejection is in error as Mathews does not teach the claimed subject matter which is absent from Wuebbels et al.

Specifically, as the Examiner admits, Wuebbels et al. does not teach the idea of providing at least one driven conveying arrangement arranged outside the transverse conveying channel and being **mounted for rotation about an approximately vertical axis** so as to remove a jam if necessary that was caused by harvested crop that emerged from the transverse conveying channel.

Mathews discloses a plurality of intake and mowing arrangements 18 and 19 (the intake function is performed by the ribs 52 and the mowing function is performed by blades 38) which are counter-rotated so as to deliver cut crop rearwardly along a path 30. No driven conveying arrangement is illustrated in addition to the intake and mowing arrangements 18 and 19. No transverse conveying channel is provided behind the intake and mowing arrangements 18 and 19 for conveying crop delivered by these arrangements. The only conveying channel that can be fairly found in Mathews is that having its center indicated by the arrows 30, with it being noted that the ribs 52 are **within** this channel. Further, since there is no transverse conveying channel, there can be no teaching of placing a conveying arrangement outside the channel in a position for engaging harvested crop that emerges from the channel.

Thus, it is not seen how Mathews would have in any way made obvious the idea of providing a conveying arrangement, **in addition to the intake and mowing arrangements**, and to mount this conveying arrangement for rotation **about an**

approximately vertical axis, as claimed.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and is likewise thought allowable. Claim 2 is thought allowable for the additional reason that it requires the at least one conveying arrangement to be mounted **above one** of the inner pair of intake and mowing arrangements, and neither Wuebbels et al. (the conveying arrangements of the three embodiments are each located between the inner pair of intake and mowing arrangements) nor Mathews teach the required placement of the conveying arrangement..

Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and is likewise thought allowable. Claim 3 is thought allowable for the additional reason that it requires two conveying arrangements to be respectively located above the inner pair of intake and mowing arrangements, and neither Wuebbels et al. or Mathews disclose the required mowing arrangements.

Claim 7 depends from claim 1 and is likewise thought allowable. Claim 7 is thought allowable for the additional reason that neither Wuebbels et al. or Mathews teach the idea of using a conveying arrangement separate from the intake and cutting arrangement which is in the form of a conveyor drum.

Claim 10 depends from claim 7 and is likewise thought allowable.

Claim 12 depends from claim 2 and is likewise thought allowable. Claim 12 is thought allowable for the additional reason that it requires the at least one conveyor arrangement to be driven together with said one of the inner pair of intake and mowing arrangements, and no conveyor arrangement , separate from the intake and mowing arrangement, is disclosed and driven as claimed.

In conclusion, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Any fees or charges due as a result of filing of the present paper may be charged against Deposit Account 04-0525. Two duplicates of this page are enclosed.

Respectfully,


Jimmie R. Oaks
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Jimmie R. Oaks
Reg. No. 24,987
Patent Department
Deere & Company
One John Deere Place
Moline, IL 61265
Telephone No. (309) 765-4392

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:
Mail Stop MP
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
on: 21 March 2005
Date


Jimmie R. Oaks
Deere & Company
Signature Date